In the Supreme Court

OF THE

United States

Office Supreme Court, U. S.
FILED
APR 28 1945
CHARLES ELMORE CROPLEY
CLERK

OCTOBER TERM, 1944

No. 1217

I. M. WARD,

Petitioner,

vs.

AUCTIONEERS ASSOCIATION OF SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA, et al.,

Respondents.

PETITION FOR A WRIT OF CERTIORARI


to the District Court of Appeal of the State of California

and

BRIEF IN SUPPORT THEREOF.

BERTRAM H. ROSS,
458 South Spring Street, Los Angeles, California,
CLARENCE A. LINN,
600 State Building, San Francisco, California,
Attorneys for Petitioner.
ROBERT W. KENNY,
Attorney General of the State of California,
600 State Building, San Francisco, California,
As Amicus Curiae.

MAX RADIN,
Of Counsel.



Subject Index

	Page
Opinion Below	2
Jurisdiction	2
Statutes Involved	2
Reasons for the Exercise of the Discretion of This Court and for the Issuance of the Writ of Certiorari as Prayed for	3
Summary Statement of the Matters Involved	4
Assignment of Errors	6
Summary of the Argument	7
Argument	7
I.	
The timeliness of the petition	7
II.	
An invalid amendment does not invalidate the amended act	11
III.	
The decision in Cline v. Frink Dairy Co. does not control this case	17
IV.	
The Cartwright Act is an important piece of legislation and its total invalidation enables competition to be stifled against common law and public policy	27
Conclusion	35

Table of Authorities Cited

Cases	Pages
American Express Co. v. Levee, 263 U. S. 19	10
Blake v. Paramount Pictures, 22 Fed. Supp. 249	17, 18
Bowles v. Willingham, 321 U. S. 503	22
Carter v. Carter Coal Co., 298 U. S. 238	22
Cline v. Frink Dairy Co., 274 U. S. 445, 47 S. Ct. 681, 71 L. Ed. 1146	4, 11, 12, 13, 14, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 23, 24, 26, 27
Dahnke-Walker Milling Co. v. Bondurant, 257 U. S. 272	26
Druman v. South Texas Lumber Co., 252 S. W. 274	20
Estate of Stierlen, 199 Cal. 140, 248 Pac. 509	8
Ex parte Sohncke, 148 Cal. 262	15
Federal Power Commission v. Hope Co., 320 U. S. 591	22
Frost v. Corporation Commission, 278 U. S. 515	13, 14, 15, 17
In re Battelle, 207 Cal. 227	18
Lanzetta v. New Jersey, 306 U. S. 451	26
Levy Leasing Co. v. Siegel, 258 U. S. 242	21, 22, 23, 27
Lewis v. Dunne, 134 Cal. 291	15
Matter of Clarey, 149 Cal. 732	15
McLean Trucking Co. v. United States, 321 U. S. 67	32
Miller v. Union B. & T. Co., 7 Cal. (2d) 31, 59 Pac. (2d) 1024, cert. denied, 299 U. S. 612	15
Morehead v. Tipaldo, 298 U. S. 587	22
Nash v. United States, 229 U. S. 373	25
Pacific Gas and Electric Co. v. Police Court of Sacramento, 251 U. S. 22	9
People v. Ruef (1910), 14 Cal. App. 576, 114 Pac. 48	8
Prudential Ins. Co. v. Cheek, 259 U. S. 530	9
Randall v. Board of Commissioners of Tippecanoe Co., Indiana, 261 U. S. 252	9

Pages

Small Co. v. American Sugar Refinery Co., 267 U. S. 233 ..... 20, 21, 22, 23, 27
Standard Chemical Co. v. Waugh, 231 N. Y. 51 .. 20, 21, 22, 23, 26
State of Georgia v. Pennsylvania R. R. decided March 26, 1945 (13 U. S. Law Week 4287) 31, 32, 34

Truax v. Corrigan, 257 U. S. 312 14

United States v. Addystone Pipe Co., 175 U. S. 211 25
United States v. Cohen Grocery Co., 255 U. S. 81 19

West Coast Hotel v. Parrish, 300 U. S. 379 22
Whitney v. California, 274 U. S. 378 26

Statutes and Texts

Antitrust in Action, No. 16, prepared by Walton Hamilton and Irene Till 29, 30
A Study of the Construction and Enforcement of the Federal Anti-trust Laws, No. 38, prepared by Milton Handler 29, 30

Business and Professions Code:
Section 2 14
Section 16,720 4
Section 16,720a 23, 33
Section 16,726 4
Section 16,750 4
Sections 16,700 to 16,758 ..... 3, 14
Sections 16,723 and 16,724 ..... 12, 16, 24, 25, 33
Sections 16,723-16,725 4

Clayton Act (U. S. C. Title 15, Section 12) 30
Competition and Monopoly in American Industry, No. 21, prepared by Dr. Clair Wilcox 29
Constitution of the State of California:
Section 4(b) 8
Section 4(c) 8
Constitution of the United States, Fourteenth Amendment 3, 35, 36
Corporate Securities Act, Section 2, subdivision 3(c) 15

Pages

Judicial Code, Section 277, 28 U.S.C.A. Section 344..... 8
Jurisdiction of the Supreme Court of the United States, 1936, Robertson and Kirkham, Section 353, page 720.... 10

Lever Act (41 U. S. Stat. 297), October 22, 1919..... 19

Municipal Code of the City of Los Angeles, California, Section 21.55, Chapter 2, Article 4, Section 24.00, g..... 32

Sherman Anti-Trust Act (U. S. C. Title 15, Section 1).... 30
Stats. of California, 1907, Chapter 530, amended by Stats. of California, 1909, Chapter 362 .....2, 3, 6, 11, 12
Stats. of Oklahoma 1921, Section 3712..... 14

28 U. S. C. A., Section 350 10

Rules

Rules on Appeal for the Supreme Court and District Courts of Appeal, Rule 28 (a) and (b) 8, 9
Rule 38 of the Supreme Court, 5a..... 35

In the Supreme Court
OF THE
United States

OCTOBER TERM, 1944

No.

I. M. WARD,
Petitioner,

vs.

AUCTIONEERS ASSOCIATION OF SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA, et al.,
Respondents.

PETITION FOR A WRIT OF CERTIORARI
to the District Court of Appeal of the State of California
and
BRIEF IN SUPPORT THEREOF.

To the Honorable Harlan Fiske Stone, Chief Justice of the United States, and to the Honorable Associate Justices of the Supreme Court of the United States:

Petitioner, I. M. Ward, respectfully prays that a writ of certiorari to review the judgment of the District Court of Appeal of the State of California,

entered in the above case on December 4, 1944 (R. p. 80), and in which a petition for hearing was denied by the Supreme Court of the State of California on February 1, 1945 (R. p. 102), be issued by the Supreme Court of the United States.

OPINION BELOW.

The opinion of the District Court of Appeal of California in the above mentioned case in which the judgment is sought to be reviewed is reported in 67 Advance California Appellate Reports at pages 194-197, inclusive, and appears in the Record, pages 74-79, inclusive.

JURISDICTION.

The judgment of the District Court of Appeal of California was entered on December 4, 1944 (R. p. 80). Under the rules of California procedure more fully set forth below (infra, pages 7-10) a petition for a hearing in the Supreme Court of California was filed on January 12, 1945 (R. p. 93), which petition was denied by the Supreme Court on February 1, 1945. (R. p. 102).

STATUTES INVOLVED.

The case involves the California Anti-Trust statute called the Cartwright Act (Stats. of California, 1907, Chapter 530), amended by Stats. of California, 1909,

Chapter 362. The Anti-Trust Act as so amended was incorporated into the Business and Professions Code of California in 1941, and became Sections 16,700 to 16,758 of that Code.

The judgment in the above case declared the Cartwright Act to be unconstitutional as in violation of the Fourteenth Amendment to the Constitution of the United States.

REASONS FOR THE EXERCISE OF THE DISCRETION OF THIS COURT AND FOR THE ISSUANCE OF THE WRIT OF CERTIORARI AS PRAYED FOR.

The special reasons which in the opinion of the petitioner warrant this court in the exercise of a sound judicial discretion, in issuing a writ of certiorari, are the following:

(1) The District Court of Appeal has decided a Federal question, to wit, that a state may not pass a statute granting a civil action for relief against a combination to restrict trade (Stats. California, 1907, Chapter 530) if a subsequent amendment provides that in such combinations a reasonable profit may be lawfully made. (Stats. of California, 1909, Chapter 362).

(2) The said decision of the District Court of California is not in accord with applicable decisions of this court; and

(3) Certiorari is requested in order to prevent the invalidation of an important legislative policy of the State of California, to wit, the legislation to

protect the community against monopolistic practices. This question has not in this form been previously decided by this court, since the decision on which the judgment of the District Court of California is based, *Cline v. Frink*, 274 U. S. 445 (47 S. Ct. 681, 71 L. Ed. 1146) is founded on a wholly different set of facts and deals with a different legal question.

SUMMARY STATEMENT OF THE MATTERS INVOLVED.

On November 29, 1943, the plaintiff filed an amended complaint for damages of $100,000 against the defendants. The complaint was entitled "Complaint for Damages for Unlawful Monopoly under the Cartwright Act".

The Cartwright Act, supra, enumerated certain trusts (Bus. and Prof. Code, Sec. 16,720) and declared those trusts void, section 16,726, with exceptions indicated in sections 16,723-16,725, and in section 16,750 granted an action to any person injured in his business by any act declared unlawful by the Cartwright Act.

On December 11, 1943, the defendants demurred to the amended complaint.

On December 23, 1943, a minute order was entered in the Superior Court of Los Angeles County, Department 35, Honorable Alfred L. Bartlett, presiding, sustaining the demurrer to the amended complaint, without leave to amend, but denying a motion for dismissal of the complaint.

On January 21, 1944, judgment was rendered by the same court that the plaintiff take, have and recover nothing by virture of the above entitled action.

Appeal was taken from this judgment to the District Court of Appeal of the Second Appellate District. This appeal was duly heard by the District Court of Appeal of the Second Appellate District, Division Two, and on December 4, 1944, judgment was rendered affirming the judgment of the Superior Court.

In his amended complaint plaintiff named as defendants Auctioneers Association of Southern California, a corporation, an association bearing the same name as the corporation, and the individual members of the Association. He alleged that plaintiff was a licensed auctioneer; that plaintiff and defendants were engaged in the business of conducting auction sales, and that defendants owned and controlled 98 per cent of the auction business; that prior to March 15, 1943, the auction business was open and competitive and that plaintiff and defendants had free access to advise the public that they were engaged in the auction business and of the times and places of sales and merchandise to be sold; that beginning March 15, 1943, defendants conspired, confederated and combined to carry out restrictions in said trade, business and commerce, and in furtherance thereof formed Auctioneers Association of Southern California and excluded plaintiff therefrom; that for many years prior to the formation of the association all auctioneers had used as their method of advising the

public of auction sales to be conducted by them and for soliciting auction business, the auction pages of the Sunday editions of the Los Angeles Times and the Los Angeles Examiner, and that prior to March 15, 1943, these newspapers had printed all auction advertising on the same pages; that in furtherance of the conspiracy defendants obtained agreements from the publishers to reserve all advertising space on said pages to the members of the association and that the newspapers thereafter refused to accept or print any advertising of plaintiff on the pages referred to, although plaintiff had written contracts with the papers to do so. Plaintiff further alleged that the acts and conduct of defendants prevented competition in the auction business and that as a result he was damaged, for which he seeks a money judgment.

These facts, so far as they are relevant, are admitted by the demurrer, and no issue is presented on the facts or the merits of the case.

ASSIGNMENT OF ERRORS.

The District Court of Appeal of California erred:

(1) In holding that the entire Cartwright Act (Stats. of California, 1907, Chapter 530, amended 1909, Chapter 362, Business and Professions Code, sections 16,700-16,758) was unconstitutional.

(2) In holding as a matter of Federal law that an invalid amendment enacted after a statute renders the entire statute invalid.

(3) In holding that if a provision in an act is invalid when applied to criminal penalties, it must also be invalid when applied to civil relief of an injured party.

SUMMARY OF THE ARGUMENT.

I.

The petition is timely.

II.

If a statute is amended and the amendment is declared to be unconstitutional, this does not of itself render the statute unconstitutional, as it stood before amendment.

III.

Terms like "reasonable" may be too vague to be a standard of guilt in a criminal statute, but may be a valid basis for predicating civil liability.

IV.

The one case relied upon in the court below is easily distinguishable from the case at bar.

ARGUMENT.

I.

THE TIMELINESS OF THE PETITION.

The decision of the District Court of Appeal of California was in this case a decision of "the highest

court of the State in which a decision could be had" (Judicial Code, sec. 277, 28 U. S. C. A. sec. 344). Under the California law, the District Courts of Appeal have appellate jurisdiction on appeal from the Superior Courts (except in cases in which appellate jurisdiction is given to the Supreme Court) in all cases at law in which the Superior Courts are given original jurisdiction.

Constitution of California, sec. 4(b).

Under section 4(c) of the Constitution of California a judgment of the District Court of Appeal becomes final sixty days after it has been pronounced. Such a judgment is deemed vacated if within sixty days the Supreme Court orders a hearing before itself.

Estate of Stierlen, 199 Cal. 140, 248 Pac. 509.

If, however, the Supreme Courts fails to order a hearing before itself, the decision of the District Court of Appeal is final for all purposes at the end of the sixty-day period.

People v. Ruef (1910), 14 Cal. App. 576, 625, 114 Pac. 48.

Rule 28 (a) and (b) of Rules on Appeal for the Supreme Court and District Courts of Appeal, adopted by the Judicial Council and made effective July 1, 1943 (22 Cal. (2) 20), provides:

> (a) (Time within which court may grant hearing). With 30 days in criminal causes and *60 days* in other causes, after the filing of a decision of the District Court of Appeal, the Supreme Court, on its own motion, or on petition may

order the cause transferred to itself for hearing and decision.

(b) (Time for filing petition). A party seeking a hearing must serve and file a petition therefor within 22 days in criminal causes, and 40 days in other causes, after the filing of the decision of the District Court of Appeal. * * *"

In this cause, the District Court of Appeal on December 4, 1944 (supra) filed its decision affirming the judgment of the Superior Court sustaining the defendants' demurrer without leave to amend, and on January 12, 1945, 39 days after the filing of the decision, the plaintiff petitioned the Supreme Court of California for a hearing in the cause. On February 1, 1945, within the sixty days allowed by Rule 28(a) of the Rules on Appeal, the Supreme Court denied the petition. This made the decision of the District Court of Appeal final in the sense required by the Judicial Code of the United States (supra).

In *Pacific Gas and Electric Co. v. Police Court of Sacramento* (251 U. S. 22) this court permitted a writ of error to run to the District Court of Appeal of California, Third Appellate District, after a showing that the appellant had exhausted his remedy in California.

Cf. also:

Randall v. Board of Commissioners of Tippecanoe Co., Indiana, 261 U. S. 252;

Prudential Ins. Co. v. Cheek, 259 U. S. 530, at p. 534.

The time for petitioning this court for certiorari runs from the entry of the final judgment of the highest court of the State in which decision could be had, except where the highest court of the state refuses to exercise its discretionary right to review, in which case the time to apply for review by this court runs from the date of such refusal by the highest state court, although the judgment or decree to be reviewed is that of the inferior state court.

Robertson and Kirkham, Jurisdiction of the Supreme Court of the United States, 1936, page 720, section 353.

Cf.:

American Express Co. v. Levee, 263 U. S. 19, at p. 21.

"*Of course,* the limit of time for applying to this court was from the date when the writ of certiorari (*sc.* in that instance before the Supreme Court of Louisiana) was refused." (Emphasis added.)

Under section 8 of the Act of February 13, 1925 (28 U. S. C. A., sec. 350), the time within which a petition for a writ of certiorari must be made is three months. This petition is filed well within the three months of the denial on February 1, 1945, of the petition for a hearing by the Supreme Court of California, which, as stated in the case mentioned above (*Am. Express v. Levee,* 263 U. S. 21), is "of course" the date at which the limit of time begins to run.

II.

AN INVALID AMENDMENT DOES NOT INVALIDATE THE AMENDED ACT.

The decision of the District Court of Appeal (67 Advance California Appellate Reports, 194) was "that the Cartwright Act was unconstitutional because it violated the Fourteenth Amendment to the Constitution of the United States". As stated in the decision, the Cartwright Act is now part of the Business and Professions Code of the State of California adopted as a code on June 15, 1937. The provisions of the Cartwright Act begin at section 16,700 of the Business and Professions Code and run to section 16,758 of the same code.

It is indicated in the Code that these sections were based on Statutes of California, 1907, Chapter 530, pp. 984, ff.

The reason assigned for holding that the Cartwright Act was unconstitutional was that the Cartwright Act was "almost identical" in its terms with the Colorado Anti-Trust Act and that the Colorado Anti-Trust Act was declared void by the Supreme Court of the United States in the case of *Cline v. Frink Dairy Co.*, 274 U. S. 445 (47 S. Ct. 681, 71 L. Ed. 1146). No other reason is advanced by the District Court of Appeal for affirming the decision in the lower court, except the finding that the Cartwright Act violated the Constitution of the United States.

This court in the case of *Cline v. Frink*, supra, declared that the reason for striking down the Colorado statute was that a certain provision in their

statute left the whole statute without a fixed standard of guilt in an adjudication involving the liberty of one accused. (*Cline v. Frink*, 274 U. S. 445, at p. 457.)

When this court in the *Cline* case found that this particular provision in the Colorado statute rendered the act unconstitutional as to those "who are convicted and prosecuted under it" (ibid. p. 466), it was considering a provision which could be regarded as an integral part of the act declared to be void in one aspect of its application. The statute was the Colorado Anti-Trust Act, being Chapter 161 of the Session Laws of the State of Colorado, for 1913. It contained a proviso which is substantially the same as sections 16,723, 16,724 of the Business and Professions Code of California. The proviso of the Colorado Act was part of the original enactment. The Colorado Supreme Court had not passed on the question of construction, and it was therefore open to this court to presume that this proviso was an essential part of the enactment of the Colorado statute, and that, if it had not been present, the statute would not have been enacted at all.

But no such presumption can be induged in the case now before the court. Sections 16,723 and 16,724 of the Business and Professions Code of California which the District Court of Appeal of California has declared to be unconstitutional, were not part of the original Cartwright Act at all, which was Chapter 530 of the California statutes of 1907. These sections were not added to the Cartwright Act until 1909, being chapter 362 of the Statutes of 1909.

It is impossible therefore to declare that these sections were so essential and integral a part of the original act that if they were stricken out the statute would not have been passed. On the contrary, it is clear that the statute *was* passed, without these sections. If, therefore, the case of *Cline v. Frink* applies to the instant case at all, it would tend at most to strike out the amendment of 1909, since no other part of the act is referred to. We should then have to read the act without the amendment, and there is nothing in the case of *Cline v. Frink* to suggest that without these amendments there would be any question of the constitutionality of the act.

If it were conceded that the amendment of 1909, so far as its effect on the criminal provisions of the Cartwright Act was concerned, was unconstitutional, certainly this could have no effect on the Act as it stood without these amendments. The authority for this proposition is overwhelming. We may cite first the statement of this court in the case of *Frost v. Corporation Commission,* 278 U. S. 515, at page 526:

> "Here it is conceded that the statute, before the amendments, was entirely valid. When passed it expressed the will of the legislature which enacted it. Without an *express* repeal, a *different legislature* undertook to create an exception, but since that body sought to express its will by an amendment which, being unconstitutional was a nullity and, therefore, powerless to work any change in the existing statute, that statute must stand as the only valid expression of the legislative intent."

It would be hard to find a more complete statement of the law and a more precise analogy to the case at bar. The court is discussing a state statute (ibid, p. 517) being Statutes of Oklahoma 1921, section 3712, not a Federal one.

The opinion goes on (p. 527) to discuss other Federal and State cases to the same effect, including *Truax v. Corrigan,* 257 U. S. 312, 341 and ends the paragraph with the following statement (p. 527):

> "The question is not affected by the fact that the amendment was accomplished by inserting a proviso in the body of the original section and reenacting the whole at length."

Obviously, *a fortiori,* it cannot be affected when the proviso or exception, while inserted in the body of the act, was *not* followed by a complete reenactment of the whole act. While the Cartwright Act was incorporated into the Business and Professions Code of California, sections 16,700 to 16,758, it was so inserted under the application of section 2 of that Code.

Business and Professions Code, section 2:

> "Continuation of existing law. The provisions of this code in so far as they are substantially the same as existing statutory provisions relating to the same subject matter shall be construed as restatements and continuations thereof, and *not as new enactments.*" (Emphasis added).

Since the court which decided the case of *Cline v. Frink, supra,* was exactly the same court in membership as that which *subsequently* decided the case of *Frost v. Commission* (supra), it can be reason-

ably inferred that if the unconstitutional exception had been incorporated into the Colorado statute by amendment subsequent to the enactment of the statute, this court would not have declared the entire Colorado statute, even in its criminal aspect, to be unconstitutional.

Not only is this the rule in this court, but it is the rule of California. We may cite:

Lewis v. Dunne, 134 Cal. 291;
Matter of Clarey, 149 Cal. 732;
Ex parte Sohncke, 148 Cal. 262.

To which may be added the recent case of *Miller v. Union B. & T. Co.,* 7 Cal. (2d) 31, 59 Pac. (2d) 1024, Cert. denied, 299 U. S. 612, in which it was decided that the 1923 amendment of subdivision 3(c) of section 2 of the Corporate Securities Act violated the Constitution of California, but that such invalidity in no way affected any other portion of the act.

"Generally stated", says the court (ibid., p. 36) "the rule is that when discrimination or unconstitutionality results from a statutory amendment, it is the amendment which is invalid and not the original portions of the statute".

The court cites the case of *Frost v. Commission* (supra), the reasoning of which it adopts and which thus becomes the last statement of the law of California on this subject, as it is of this court.

No case has been cited and no case has been found upon reasonably diligent search in which the finding by a court that an amendment is unconstitutional has been permitted to invalidate the statute amended.

If this were a decision that in California an invalid amendment *as a matter of state law* repeals the entire amended statute, despite the rules against implied repeal and despite the previous decisions of the California Supreme Court, it would concededly not be subject to review by this court. But that is not the case.

The District Court of Appeal did not decide that sections 16,723-16,724 of the Business and Professions Code of California were void under California law, but that they were void as a matter of Federal law. In order to make them void, it presented what, it is submitted, is an erroneous interpretation of the Fourteenth Amendment to the Constitution of the United States and based it on what seems to the petitioner a wholly erroneous interpretation of a decision of this court, *Cline v. Frink* (supra).

Nor did it decide the effect of an unconstitutional amendment as a matter of California law. It did, it is true, speak of these sections as "inseparable" from the rest of the Cartwright Act, but it expressly based this characterization of them on the fact that in *Cline v. Frink* this court had declared the proviso in the Colorado statute to be inseparable from the rest of the statute. The California District Court of Appeal, in the case at bar, did not advert to the vital difference in the statutes, so far as the relation of the proviso to the entire law was concerned. It did not even mention, much less decide, that there was no difference between the effect of later amendment which is declared to be unconstitutional and an unconstitutional proviso which is part of the original statute.

The only decision which does advert to this difference and which, it is submitted, erroneously declares the difference to be immaterial, is the decision of *Blake v. Paramount Pictures* (22 Fed. Supp. 249) which is a decision of the Federal District Court and is therefore in no sense authoritative for California law. Although *Blake v. Paramount Pictures* was referred to in argument by the respondents, it is nowhere mentioned by the District Court of Appeal in their decision.

It is clear, therefore, that in asking for a review of this case, the petitioner is not presenting a matter of California law, but of Federal law, and on this Federal question the decision is directly at variance with the decision of this court in *Frost v. Commission* (supra). It will be remembered that in that case this court was also construing a state statute (supra) and held that an amendment in violation of the Federal Constitution did not affect the statute itself.

III.

THE DECISION IN CLINE v. FRINK DAIRY CO. DOES NOT CONTROL THIS CASE.

But even if the Cartwright Act had contained the challenged proviso in its original form there would have been nothing unconstitutional in applying the Act to the situation before the court in this case.

The decision in the District Court of Appeal of California, as has been stated, is wholly predicated on the decision of this court in the case of *Cline v.*

Frink Dairy Co., 274 U. S. 445. The only other case cited in the opinion is the case of *In re Battelle*, 207 Cal. 227, 251, and that case is mentioned merely for the casual statement that the Colorado Anti-Trust Act is a "replica of the Cartwright Act". In the argument before the District Court of Appeal, the respondents relied strongly on the *Cline* case and on the case of *Blake v. Paramount Pictures*, 22 Fed. Supp. 249, decided in the District Court of the United States, which held that the decision in the case of *Cline v. Frink* required the declaration that the Cartwright Act like the Colorado Anti-Trust Act was wholly unconstitutional.

But the decision in the *Cline* case rested upon a wholly different foundation from any that can be assigned to the case at bar. In the *Cline* case, the respondent Dairy Company had sought and obtained an injunction against the District Attorney for the City and County of Denver, Colorado, enjoining him from prosecuting the respondent for violation of the Colorado Anti-Trust Act, a violation which subjected the company and its directors to criminal penalties.

It is these criminal penalties, and these alone, which are made the basis of the decision of this court in *Cline v. Frink Co.*

This is apparent from the entire case. The final decision is expressed in these words:

> "We conclude that the Anti-Trust statute of Colorado is void in that those who are *prosecuted and convicted* under it will be denied due process of law." (Page 465).

To which we may add the following:

> "We think that the Act is so vague and uncertain in its description of what shall constitute *its criminal violations* that it is invalid under the Fourteenth Amendment." (Page 453).
>
> "We are now considering a case of state legislation and threatened prosecution in a state court where only the Fourteenth Amendment applies: but that amendment requires that there shall be due process of law, and this certainly imposes upon a State an obligation to frame *its criminal statutes* so that those to whom they are addressed may know what standard of conduct is intended to be required." (Page 458).
>
> "We held that the provision (sc. of an Oklahoma statute) contained no ascertainable *standard of guilt.*" (Page 459).
>
> "But it will not do to hold an average man *to the peril of an indictment* for the unwise exercise of his economic or business knowledge." (Page 465).

This court in the *Cline* case leaned heavily on the case of *United States v. Cohen Grocery Co.*, 255 U. S. 81, in which it was held that a section of the Lever Act (41 U. S. Stat. 297), of October 22, 1919, was void because it imposed a *criminal penalty* for a conspiracy to "exact excessive prices for necessaries". The term "excessive" was held to be too vague to create "an ascertainable standard of *guilt*". It is only this section of the Lever Act which was stricken down in the *Cohen Grocery* case. And the court went on to say in that case (cited in the *Cline* case, page 454):

> "Observe that the section forbids no specific or definite act."

The court, in the *Cline* case, admits that in many situations, terms like "reasonable", "undue" and the like, terms which involve the application of standards of conduct and which in the last analysis must be applied by a jury, are used even in criminal statutes (pp. 460-465) but it distinguishes these situations from that presented in the case before it and finds that to use such standards in the situation of the *Cline* case in order to determine guilt makes a statute void.

It is quite true that in the case of *Small Co. v. American Sugar Refinery Co.*, 267 U. S. 233, in an opinion written by Justice McReynolds, the court declared that the uncertainty involved in the standards set up in the Lever Act might make the act unconstitutional in civil matters as well as criminal. The case dealt with a purchase of sugar challenged as excessive under that Act. And in *Standard Chemical Co. v. Waugh*, 231 N. Y. 51, the majority in the New York Court of Appeal, in an opinion of Mr. Justice Cardozo, held that the Lever Act, as applied to a purchase of chemicals, was void because the standards set up to test validity, were uncertain and vague. The *Standard Chemical* case is quoted with approval by this court in the *Small* case, but neither case, nor yet the case of *Druman v. South Texas Lumber Co.*, 252 S. W. 274, 275, also cited by Mr. Justice McReynolds, can be taken to support the contention that the mere use of a term like "reasonable", as a test of legally permitted conduct, renders a legislative enactment

void in all its civil, as well as in its criminal, applications.

Both the *Small* and the *Standard Chemical* cases, which it quotes, were before this court in the *Cline* case, and if there was no difference between civil and criminal cases in the application of the term "reasonable profits", it would have been wholly unnecessary to stress exclusively as the court does in the *Cline* case (supra) the criminal character of the act involved.

So far from making the invalidity of the "reasonable test" as generally effective in civil cases as in criminal, this court in *Small v. American Sugar Refinery* (supra) took especial pains to state that this was not so. The court distinguished *Levy Leasing Co. v. Siegel,* 258 U. S. 242, in which a statute making unreasonable rents invalid was upheld as constitutional, by saying the following:

> "In Levy Leasing Co. v. Siegel, a civil case arising out of the war-time rent law of the State of New York, this court referred to the L. Cohen Grocery case as 'dealing with definitions of crime' and declared it not applicable."

The important part of the reference was the declaration that the decision was not applicable to the case then under consideration. One dealt with a Federal statute prohibiting the sale of sugar at unjust, unreasonable and excessive prices, and the other with a state statute directed against reserving unjust, unreasonable and oppressive rent in the leasing of real property in a city for dwelling purposes".

The case of *Levy Leasing Co. v. Siegel* has been frequently cited, most recently in *Bowles v. Willingham,* 321 U. S. 503, 517.

We may also compare *Federal Power Commission v. Hope Co.,* 320 U. S. 591.

Indeed, in *Carter v. Carter Coal Co.,* 298 U. S. 238, at page 333, Justice Cardozo, whose statement in the *Standard Chemical* case is the basis of Justice McReynolds reasoning in the *Small* case, strongly asserts that the test of "reasonableness" may well be constitutional in civil cases. Again, in *Morehead v. Tipaldo,* 298 U. S. 587, 632, in Justice Stone's dissenting opinion, the use of this test to invalidate a labor contract was upheld as constitutional and the *Levy Leasing Co.* case was cited. It will be remembered that the *Morehead* case was in effect overruled in *West Coast Hotel v. Parrish,* 300 U. S. 379, 399, so that the dissent in the former case represented the majority in the latter.

If the *Small* case is taken to be a statement that in general the term "reasonable" or "excessive" in a statute regulating commercial activity of any kind makes the statute void, it may be said that the cases mentioned, *Carter v. Carter Coal Co.* (supra), *Federal Power Comm. v. Hope Co.* (supra), *Bowles v. Willingham* (supra), all later than the *Small* case, have disapproved of this excessive extension of the doctrine of the *Cohen Grocery* case. Indeed, the *Small* case has been since cited only to support the doctrine that "reasonable" and "excessive" are insufficient

guides in a criminal prosecution, and not to support a general application of that doctrine to civil suits.

There seems to be little doubt that the *Levy Leasing* case correctly states the law. And since, as stated in the *Small* case, the difference of the situation saved the constitutionality of the New York Act in spite of the fact that it applied a test of "reasonability", attention is here respectfully directed to the difference between the situation in this case and the situations in all the cases, the *Small* case and the *Standard Chemical* case, in which the reasonability test was held to make the Act unconstitutional. All of them were cases in which prices of commodities were set which were challenged as unreasonable. This was also in the *Cline* case. The court dwelt on the difficulties involved in deciding whether a profit earned or a price charged was or was not reasonable.

But when the question involved, not the sale of a commodity but the renting of a house, the court felt that the maintenance of a reasonable standard in rent was not so vague and uncertain as to make the law requiring such a standard, void as unconstitutional.

In the case at bar, there is no question of the sale of commodities. The business involved is that of rendering services. The plaintiff and respondents are auctioneers. The respondents combined, not to set an unreasonable price on goods, but simply to keep the petitioner from doing business. The applicable section of the Cartwright Act (Business and Professions Code, sec. 16,720a) forbade a combination which attempts "to create or carry on restric-

tion in trade or commerce". The complaint alleges and the demurrer for the purposes of this action admits, that the defendants controlling 98% of the auction business in the City of Los Angeles, California, combined to induce two of the largest newspapers in that city to refuse to accept advertisements from the petitioner, a licensed auctioneer, and thus to deprive the petitioner of one of the most effective ways of carrying on the business for which he had been duly licensed.

Even if the act, as it now stands, had been enacted as a single statute, so that the later enacted proviso (Business and Professions Code, sections 16,723, 16,-724) could be regarded as an integral part of the Act, the situation would be fundamentally different from that of the *Cline* case. The defendants there could claim that their combination was to secure a reasonable profit on what they sold. It is said in the *Cline* case:

> "It would, therefore, be a complete defense for the defendant to prove in this case that it is impossible to sell milk and milk products except by trust methods and make a reasonable profit, if he also showed that by such methods he had in fact only made a reasonable profit." (Page 457).

It is merely necessary to consider these words, on which the entire decision in the *Cline* case is based, to see how inapplicable they are to the case at bar. It is not conceivable that the defendants could assert that in order to make a reasonable profit they must have the power of driving a single competitor out

of the business for which he had been duly licensed by the competent authorities of his city. Certainly, they would not be heard if they had offered such proof. The very nature of the business excludes the application of the proviso contained in the two sections of the Code in question, sec. 16,723, 16,724.

It is expressly declared that if the "reasonableness" had been the kind of reasonableness used in determining "forbidden and permissible restraints of trade" at the common law (page 460) there would have been no objection to it, even in a criminal statute. Indeed, if this test of reasonableness were not applied, the Sherman Anti-Trust law would have to be declared unconstitutional.

Nash v. United States, 229 U. S. 373.

The deliberate exclusion of a competitor by machinations and combinations is the very essence of forbidden restraints of trade at common law, and in regard to this there can be no gradations and no issue of reasonability.

The invalidity of the Lever Act or the Colorado Act was due to the fact that it penalized a combination which would have been legal at the common law, at any rate at the later common law, after the laws against forestalling and regrating had fallen into abeyance. The case of *United States v. Addystone Pipe Co.,* 175 U. S. 211, presents a situation in which conduct permissible or forbidden at common law had created a tradition of what was reasonable and what was not. Well within that tradition of unreasonability are to be found acts which arbitrarily drive a competi-

tor from business for no better reason than that he is a competitor.

The fact that some of the cases are those in which war emergency legislation was involved cannot affect the law of the case. The *Small* case (supra) and the *Standard Chemical* case (supra) held that "reasonable" and "excessive" prices were too difficult to determine. This difficulty, it is submitted, would be far greater during a war emergency.

Accordingly, even if the criminal penalties and not the most characteristic of common law civil remedies, had been invoked by the petitioner, the case would not come within the reasoning of *Cline v. Frick Co.,* which is the sole basis of the decision here sought to be reviewed.

Just as a statute, even if not void on its face, may be challenged as unconstitutional because void as applied, *Dahnke-Walker Milling Co. v. Bondurant,* 257 U. S. 272; *Whitney v. California,* 274 U. S. 378 (concurring opinion of Brandeis and Holmes, JJ.) so a statute which might be unconstitutional if applied in one way, may be perfectly constitutional if applied in another.

If it be true that "no one may be required at peril of life, liberty or property to speculate as to the meaning of penal statutes" (*Lanzetta v. New Jersey,* 306 U. S. 451, 453) it is equally true that where, as in this case, the statute forbids combination to restrict trade, no speculation is necessary to apprise a violator that to combine to prevent a competitor from en-

gaging in competition, outside the well-known common law exceptions, is a combination to restrict trade.

This court has never passed on the question whether the decision in the *Cline* case, the *Cohen Grocery* case, the *Small* case, all of which deal with sales of commodities, may without more be applied to the business of auctioneering or the rendering of services in general. The New York rent case, *Levy Leasing Co. v. Siegel,* 258 U. S. 242, frequently cited with approval, would seem to indicate that the decisions are inapplicable.

IV.

THE CARTWRIGHT ACT IS AN IMPORTANT PIECE OF LEGISLATION AND ITS TOTAL INVALIDATION ENABLES COMPETITION TO BE STIFLED AGAINST COMMON LAW AND PUBLIC POLICY.

The Cartwright Act is a State Anti-Trust Act supplementing the Federal Sherman Anti-Trust Act. The Federal Act applies to interstate commerce. The Cartwright Act and similar state acts, apply the same principles to intrastate commerce. This state legislation furnishes a highly important aid to the carrying out of the very public policy which is enforced by the common law precedents referred to in the *Cline* case (supra), a public policy declared in almost every state of the Union to be essential to its economic and social welfare.

That policy is the suppression of monopoly, or at any rate, the checking of monopoly. In this respect the Sherman Act, the Clayton Act and the Cartwright

Act reinforce long-established law and continue a struggle as old as the establishment of our national independence. The purpose of the Cartwright Act, as of all similar acts, besides the creation of penal sanctions not at issue here, is to simplify procedures of redress for those adversely affected by these monopolistic practices, denounced for so long a period of time by American common law and American legislation, both State and Federal.

Every single state in the Union with the exception of Vermont, has either by statute or by judicial decision declared that monopoly in whatever form it is attempted, by whatever devices it is carried out, is a pernicious practice; that it runs wholly counter to the foundation of our economy, and that the public interest is eminently served when monopoly in all its forms is eliminated so far as is possible.

Compare for the list of state statutes and decisions Volume I and Supplement of the Marketing Laws Survey Project, sponsored by the Department of Commerce and carried out by the Work Projects Administration, at Los Angeles, California, in 1942.

Several of the monographs published for the Temporary National Economic Committee, set up by the Seventy-sixth Congress to "investigate the concentration of economic power" have dealt specifically with the problem of the control of monopoly by means of "anti-trust" laws like the Federal Sherman Act and the Clayton Act and the state laws like the Cartwright Act of California. Of these monographs we may cite:

No. 16, *Antitrust in Action*: prepared by Walton Hamilton and Irene Till;

No. 21, *Competition and Monopoly in American Industry;* prepared by Dr. Clair Wilcox.

No. 38, *A Study of the Construction and Enforcement of the Federal Anti-trust Laws;* prepared by Milton Handler.

These three writers are trained economists, and in two instances, Mr. Hamilton and Mr. Handler, trained lawyers as well. They are aware of the difficulties of enforcing anti-trust laws. But the complaint they make of them is that they are not severe enough and not sufficiently enforced.

Dr. Wilcox (Monograph No. 21, pp. 16-18) gives ten of the injuries to our economic system caused by monopoly.

"First: it causes an uneconomic allocation of productive resources. * * *

"Second: monopoly offers the consumer no protection against extortion. * * *

"Third: monopoly offers the worker no protection against low wages, long hours and poor conditions of employment. * * *

"Fourth: monopoly inflicts no penalty on inefficiency. * * *

"Fifth: monopoly is not conducive to economic progress. * * *

"Sixth: monopoly prevents the full utilization of productive capacity. * * *

"Seventh: monopoly obstructs adjustments to economic change. * * *

"Eighth: monopoly impedes the raising of the general plane of living. * * *

"Ninth: monopoly contributes to inequality in the distribution of income. * * *

"Tenth and finally: monopoly threatens the existence of private enterprise and representative government. * * *

"In the words of the Federal Trade Commission (Hearings, TNEC, 76th Cong. 1st Sess., Part 5, p. 2200) 'The capitalist system of free initiative is not immortal, but is capable of dying and of dragging down with it the system of democratic government. Monopoly constitutes the death of capitalism and the genesis of authoritarian government'."

Mr. Handler in Monograph No. 38, p. 100, ends his penetrating analysis of the enforcement of statutes identical in purpose with the Cartwright Act, e. g., the Sherman Anti-Trust Act (U. S. C. Title 15, Sec. 1) and the Clayton Act (U. S. C. Title 15, Sec. 12), with these words:

"Our study of the anti-trust laws and their administration has satisfied us that the objectives of these laws are socially desirable, are economically sound and are capable of practical attainment."

And finally Mr. Walton Hamilton, who in some respects is the sharpest critic of anti-trust laws, criticizes them only because they are not severely enough enforced. He states (Monograph No. 16, p. 119):

> "Antitrust is a symbol of democracy. It is an assertion that every industry is affected with a public interest. Quite apart from its operation, it keeps alive within law and public policy a value which must not be sacrificed or abridged. It asserts the firm, the trade, the economy to be the instrument of the general welfare."

This court in the recent decision of the *State of Georgia v. Pennsylvania R. R.* decided March 26, 1945 (13 U. S. Law Week 4287) has reaffirmed the general policy of the United States in the matter of conspiracy to restrain trade, the conspiracy which the Cartwright Act sought to prevent and *which the decision of the District Court of Appeal, here sought to be reviewed, not only clothes with complete legal immunity, civil as well as criminal, but declares is constitutionally immune from any attempt of the State to suppress or prevent.* The conspiracy in the case of *Georgia v. Pennsylvania R. R.* related to establishing discriminatory rates. These rates, said Mr. Justice Douglas, "may cause a blight no less serious than the spread of noxious gas over the land or the deposit of sewage in the streams. They may affect the prosperity and welfare of the state as profoundly as any diversion of waters from the rivers."

The practices of the respondent in this case are only one example of those sought to be avoided by the Cartwright Act and other examples within the definition of unlawful combination of that Act include precisely those combinations to control rates for service which are the subject of the court's animadversion in the *Georgia* case.

The Interstate Commerce Commission has the duty, it is said in the case just cited (13 U. S. Law Week 4290) "to give weight to the anti-trust policy of the nation before approving mergers and combinations" and quotes to the same effect the case of *McLean Trucking Co. v. United States*, 321 U. S. 67. And while the case of *Georgia v. Pennsylvania R. R.* was decided by a divided court, the dissent was based upon the questioned right of the State to appear on behalf of its citizens. No doubt is expressed that a "conspiracy to adopt and maintain unjust, unlawful, excessive or discriminatory freight rates" is an actionable wrong. 13 U. S. Law Week 4295.) Both these recent statements of this court reaffirm the fundamental character of the anti-trust policy of the federal government. The Cartwright Act was designed to further that anti-trust policy by adding state enforcement to what the federal government with so much force is attempting to do for the entire country.

The business of auctioneering is sufficiently affected with a public interest to permit the State or the City to require those who engage in it to be licensed. Such a license was obtained by the petitioner. Licenses to conduct the business of auctioneering are required under the Municipal Code of the City of Los Angeles, California, Section 21.55. This business is further regulated by Chapter 2, Article 4 of that Code. Section 24.00, g, of the Code requires that in order to conduct the business of auctioneering "applicant shall furnish sufficient and satisfactory proof

of good moral character and such other qualifications as the Board may require".

What we have here is therefore a situation in which a group of persons undertake by combination and conspiracy—the combination and conspiracy are admitted by the demurrer—to render the license ineffectual by exercising an economic compulsion upon the newspapers in which the petitioner must advertise to attract employment of his services. Under the conditions of a large city, only such newspaper advertising will enable him to get such employment.

It is alleged by the petitioner and admitted by the demurrer that the newspapers were willing to accept his advertisements and yielded to the pressure of the respondents when they refused them later.

It is to prevent this that section 16,720(a) of the Cartwright Act declaring illegal a "trust" which had as its purpose "to create or carry out restrictions in trade or commerce" and to this the proviso in section 16,723 and 16,724, whether constitutional or not, has no application, since no "reasonable profits" can be predicated on an arbitrary exclusion of a competitor from business. To give the proviso, which entered the act as a later amendment, the force of invalidating the entire act, threatens not only the California Cartwright Act but the entire scheme of legislation designed to check monopoly, especially in the direct and brutal form of conspiring to deny a competitor a chance to make a living.

Certainly it is an astounding holding to say that the State of California is prevented by the Fourteenth Amendment from carrying out a policy which lies at the foundation of our economic system and which protects its citizens from being deprived of their livelihood by conspiracy of their competitors. The oppressive acts which drove the American colonists into rebellion arose from just such commercial monopolies as those which the Cartwright Act defines and declares to be unlawful. If the Cartwright Act is unconstitutional—with or without the Amendment of 1909—it is hard to see what constitutional warrant there can be for the Sherman Act, the Clayton Act, the Interstate Commerce Act or any of the hundreds of statutes or decisions which have in terms more severe and rigid even than those of the Cartwright Act attempted to safeguard our economic tradition of free enterprise and free competition.

It is scarcely necessary to point out that the effect of this case goes far beyond the interest of the petitioner in it. The suppression of monopolistic practices that deliberately and nakedly seek to destroy competition is so definitely a public interest that in the case referred to (*Georgia v. Pennsylvania R.R.*, supra) the State was permitted to bring the action itself as *parens patriae*. It is for that reason that in this case the Attorney General of California has joined the petitioner in this petition to review the case at bar. The State of California as *parens patriae* is vitally concerned when practices are declared to be lawful and free from any State control, which destroy

the livelihood of its citizens and render them subject to exactions or driven from any field of enterprise, by combination and conspiracy of those who control business in any field.

CONCLUSION.

The petition for a writ of certiorari in this case is, therefore, based on the fact (cf. Rule 38 of the Supreme Court, 5a) that the District Court of Appeal of California has decided an important federal question which has not heretofore been determined by this court, to wit:

(a) That as a matter of federal law an amendment of a state statute which is made in a different session from that in which the statute itself was enacted and which is declared to be unconstitutional in some of its aspects will cause the entire statute in all its aspects to be void as in violation of the Constitution of the United States;

(b) That a state statute violates the Fourteenth Amendment to the Constitution of the United States if it allows a civil action against those who have combined to restrain trade.

(c) That a statute invalidating restraint on comment of a state statute which is made in a different dered under public license, is unconstitutional, when enforced by an action for civil remedies, without invoking criminal penalties.

(d) That the attempt of a state to control monopoly in intrastate commerce, by defining monopoly as a combination which earns unreasonable profits, is void under the Fourteenth Amendment of the Constitution of the United States.

The writ of certiorari should be granted by this Court to the end that a correct decision on this important federal question may be had.

Dated, San Francisco, California,
April 16, 1945.

Respectfully submitted,

BERTRAM H. ROSS,
CLARENCE A. LINN,
Attorneys for Petitioner.

ROBERT W. KENNY,
Attorney General of the State of California,
As Amicus Curiae.

MAX RADIN,
Of Counsel.



IN THE

Supreme Court of the United States

OCTOBER TERM, 1944.

No. 1217

I. M. WARD,

Petitioner,

vs.

AUCTIONEERS ASSOCIATION OF SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA et al,


Respondents.

BRIEF OF RESPONDENTS IN OPPOSITION TO PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI

CHARLES J. KATZ,
SAMUEL W. BLUM,
111 West Seventh Street, Los Angeles 14,
MAURICE SCHULMAN,
923 Associated Realty Building, Los Angeles 14,
Attorneys for Respondents.

SAMUEL W. BLUM
Of counsel.

Parker & Company, Law Printers, Los Angeles. March 31, 1945.



SUBJECT INDEX.

PAGE

Statement of case 2

The Cartwright Act 4

Reasons for denying the petition for writ of certiorari 8

Summary of argument 9

Argument 10

I.

The construction and meaning of a state statute, and whether any part thereof is separable from the remainder, is a matter of state law, and the state courts construction thereof must be accepted by this court in determining whether such statute is repugnant to the Federal Constitution 10

(a) The construction placed upon the Cartwright Act by the District Court of Appeal, that Section 16720, Business and Professions Code, is not independent of, or severable from, Sections 16723 and 16724 of the same code, is binding upon this court in determining whether the Cartwright Act violated the 14th Amendment 10

(b) The construction placed upon the Cartwright Act by the District Court of Appeal, that the provisions thereof are not separable, is correct 14

II.

The decision of this court in Cline v. Frink Dairies, supra, is controlling in this case, and the District Court of Appeal correctly held that the Cartwright Act contravenes the 14th Amendment of the Federal Constitution 22

PAGE

III.

The principles of due process of law requiring reasonable certainty of description in fixing a standard for exacting obedience from a person in advance applies equally in civil proceedings 24

IV.

The Cartwright Act has not been considered important legislation in California since the Cline v. Frink Dairies decision and its invalidity has generally been recognized in this state since the rendition of the aforesaid decision 29

Conclusion 31

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES CITED.

CASES.	PAGE
A. B. Small Co. v. American Sugar Refining Company, 267 U. S. 233, 69 L. Ed. 589	18, 23, 25, 28
Battelle, In re, 207 Cal. 227	23
Blake v. Paramount Pictures, 22 Fed. Supp. 249	14, 19, 22, 26
Carter v. Carter Coal Co., 298 U. S. 238, 80 L. Ed. 1160	15, 17
Champlin Refining Co. v. Corporation Com., 286 U. S. 210, 76 L. Ed. 1063	24, 27
Cline v. Frink Dairies (274 U. S. 445; 47 S. Ct. 681; 71 L. Ed. 1146)	8, 9, 14, 18, 22, 23, 24, 26, 27, 28, 30, 31
Coca-Cola Bottling Co. v. Feliciano, 32 Cal. App. (2d) 351	20
Connally v. General Construction Co., 269 U. S. 385, 70 L. Ed. 322	24, 27
County of Los Angeles v. Jones, 6 Cal. (2d) 695	20
Dalton v. Jewett, 88 Cal. 530	20
Dunman v. So. Tex. Lumber Co., 252 S. W. 274	27
Hale v. McGettigan, 114 Cal. 112	16
International Harvester Co. v. Kentucky, 234 U. S. 216, 58 L. Ed. 1284	11, 13, 23
King v. West Virginia, 216 U. S. 92, 54 L. Ed. 396	11, 13
Lanzetta v. New Jersey, 306 U. S. 451, 83 L. Ed. 889	24
Levy Leasing Co. v. Siegel, 258 U. S. 242	27, 28
Meyers v. Wells Fargo & Co., 223 U. S. 298, 56 L. Ed. 445	11, 13
Morehead v. New York ex rel. Tipaldo, 298 U. S. 587, 80 L. Ed. 1347	11, 22
Olson v. Smith, 195 U. S. 332, 49 L. Ed. 224	11, 12
Pasadena City High School District v. Upjohn, 206 Cal. 775	17
People v. Mancuso, 255 N. Y. 463, 175 N. E. 177, 76 A. L. R. 514	12
People v. Western Fruit Growers, 22 Cal. (2d) 494	18
People v. Yosemite Lumber Co., 191 Cal. 267	15
Pierce v. County of Solano, 62 Cal. App. 465	18
Pierce v. Riley, 21 Cal. App. (2d) 513	20
Portnoy, In re, 21 Cal. (2d) 237	17
Quong Ham Wah Co. v. I. A. C. of California, 255 U. S. 445, 65 L. Ed. 723	11

PAGE

Redlands Foothill Groves v. Jacobs, 30 Fed. Supp. 995 22
Reed Orchard Co. v. Superior Court, 19 Cal. App. 648 20
Reynolds, Guardianship of, 60 Cal. App. (2d) 569 20
Robison v. Payne, 20 Cal. App. (2d) 103 17
Sherer v. Flannery, 68 Cal. App. 91 18
Smith v. Board of Trustees, 198 Cal. 301 20
Standard Chemicals Etc. Co. v. Waugh Chemical Corp., 231 N. Y. 51, 131 N. E. 566, 14 A. L. R. 1054 27
United States v. Cohen Grocery Co., 255 U. S. 81, 41 S. Ct. Rep. 295, 63 L. Ed. 516 ..... 18, 23, 28
W. W. Cargill Co. v. Minnesota, 180 U. S. 452, 45 L. Ed. 619 ..... 11, 13

STATUTES.

Business and Professions Code, Sec. 2 19
Business and Professions Code, Sec. 24 ..... 4, 14, 15, 19, 20, 25
Business and Professions Code, Secs. 16700 to 16768 4
Business and Professions Code, Sec. 16701 ..... 4, 14, 19
Business and Professions Code, Sec. 16720..5, 8, 10, 14, 15, 17, 19
Business and Professions Code, Sec. 16723 ..... 6, 7, 8, 10, 14, 15, 17, 19, 20
Business and Professions Code, Sec. 16724 ..... 7, 8, 10, 14, 15, 17, 19, 20
Business and Professions Code, Sec. 16725 7
Business and Professions Code, Sec. 16726 7
Business and Psofessions Code, Sec. 16750 7
Business and Professions Code, Sec. 16755 ..... 7, 24
California Constitution, Art. IV, Sec. 24 18
Cartwright Act (Stats. 1907, Chap. 530) 4
Cartwright Act (Stats. 1909, Chap. 362) 4
Rules of the Supreme Court, Rule 38, par. 3 2

TEXTBOOKS.

50 American Jurisprudence 34 24
23 California Jurisprudence 612 24

IN THE

Supreme Court of the United States

OCTOBER TERM, 1944.

No. 1217

I. M. WARD,

Petitioner,

vs.

AUCTIONEERS ASSOCIATION OF SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA et al,

Respondents.

BRIEF OF RESPONDENTS IN OPPOSITION TO PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI

To the Honorable Harlan Fisk Stone, Chief Justice of the United States, and to the Honorable Associate Justices of the Supeme Court of the United States:

Respondents respectfully contend that the Petition for Writ of Certiorari filed herein presents nothing to sustain any of the grounds upon which the Writ is sought and the Petition should be denied.

We respectfully submit that the Judgment of the District Court of Appeal of the State of California, sought to be reviewed by certiorari, is correct; that it is fully supported by, and is in conformity with, the decisions of this Honorable Court; that no new or undetermined federal question has been presented, but that the main

points stated in said Petition primarily concern California state law; and that all constitutional questions urged are conclusively settled by the decisions of this Court adversely to petitioner's contention.

Before proceeding further, it is not untimely to state that the printed copy of the Petition, Brief, and Record were *not served upon counsel for respondents within ten days after the Petition was filed*, as required by Rule 38, paragraph 3, of Rules of Supreme Court.

Nevertheless, we will proceed to answer the Petition upon the merits.

Statement of Case.

On September 2, 1943, petitioner, as plaintiff, filed an action against the respondents, as defendants, in the Superior Court of the State of California, in and for the County of Los Angeles, entitled: "Complaint for Damages for Unlawful Monopoly under the Cartwright Act", for $100,000.00 damages. [R. pp. 1-7.][1] A Demurrer thereto [R. pp. 7-14] was sustained. [R. p. 15.] On November 29, 1943, an Amended Complaint was filed [R. pp. 15-21] which is identical with, and an exact replica of, the original Complaint, with the sole exception of a very minor and immaterial change found in paragraph XI thereof. [R. p. 19.] On December 11, 1943, respondents filed a Demurrer to the Amended Complaint [R. pp. 21-36] and a Notice of Motion to Strike First Amended Complaint from Files. [R. pp. 42-45.] On December 23, 1943, a Minute Order in said Superior

---

[1]All references to Record refer to the printed Transcript of Record.

Court was entered in Department 35, the Honorable Alfred L. Bartlett, Judge Presiding, sustaining the Demurrer without leave to amend and denying respondents' Motion to Strike First Amended Complaint from Files. [R. p. 37.] On January 21, 1944, Judgment in favor of respondents and against petitioner was signed and entered. [R. pp. 37-39.]

Thereafter an appeal was taken to the District Court of Appeal of the State of California, Second Appellate District [R. p. 39] and on December 4, 1944, the Judgment of the Superior Court was affirmed. [R. pp. 45-49.]

On January 13, 1945, petitioner filed a Petition for Hearing by the Supreme Court [R. pp. 49-58] and on February 1, 1945, the Petition for Hearing was denied. [R. p. 60.]

The substance of the Amended Complaint is fully set forth in the Opinion of the District Court of Appeal [R. pp. 45-48] and need not be repeated herein.

Petitioner's statement, ". . . but denying a Motion for Dismissal of the Complaint" (on page 4 of the Petition for Cert.), is incorrect. It was respondents' *Motion to Strike First Amended Complaint from Files,* and for a dismissal, which was denied. [R. p. 37.] This Motion, based upon the ground that the amended and the original Complaints were identical, had been filed concurrently with, and as an alternative for, the Demurrer. [R. p. 42.]

The Cartwright Act.

The Cartwright Act was enacted in 1907 (Stats. 1907, chap. 530.) The severity of its all-inclusive provisions soon caused the Legislature of California, in 1909, to reenact this statute with certain amendments thereto, which created various exceptions to the acts therein denounced as crimes. (Stats, of 1909, chap. 362.)

In 1941, the California Legislature again reenacted this law by including it in the Business and Professions Code, being sections 16700 to 16768, inclusive. In so repealing and reenacting the Act in the Business and Professions Code, the Legislature of California by statute (sec. 16701) incorporated a new section and provided a rule of construction for the various provisions of the Act and for the determination of the separability of its various provisions. The pertinent portions of this section reads as follows:

> **"Sec. 16701. Separability of provisions: How determined: Trust redefined.**
>
> Section 24 of this code shall not determine the separability of the provisions of this chapter, one from another. Such separability shall be determined by whether the provisions of Chapter 530 of the Statutes of 1907 and the provisions of Chapter 362 of the Statutes of 1909 are separable among themselves and as to each other. . . ."

Section 24 of the Business and Professions Code which, by the foregoing section has expressly been rejected as a rule of construction in determining the validity or invalidity of the Cartwright Act, reads as follows:

> **"Sec. 24. Invalidity of provision or application.** If any provision of this code, or the ap-

plication thereof, to any person or circumstance, is held invalid, the remainder of the code, or the application of such provision to other persons or circumstances, shall not be affected thereby."

It is the contents of this rejected section upon which petitioner, both in this Court and in the various California courts, based his argument relating to separability of the provisions of the Cartwright Act.

The pertinent provisions of the Business and Professions Code involved herein read as follows:

"**Sec. 16720. Trust defined: Purposes.** A trust is a combination of capital, skill or acts by two or more persons for any of the following puposes:

(a) To create or carry out restrictions in trade or commerce.

(b) To limit or reduce the production, or increase the price of merchandise or of any commodity.

(c) To prevent competition in manufacturing, making, transportation, sale or purchase of merchandise, produce or any commodity.

(d) To fix at any standard or figure, whereby its price to the public or consumer shall be in any manner controlled or established, any article or commodity of merchandise, produce or commerce intended for sale, barter, use or consumption in this State.

(e) To make or enter into or execute or carry out any contracts, obligations or agreements of any kind or description, by which they do all or any or any combination of any of the following:

(1) Bind themselves not to sell, dispose of or transport any article or any commodity or any article of trade, use, merchandise, commerce or consumption below a common standard figure, or fixed value.

(2) Agree in any manner to keep the price of such article, commodity or transportation at a fixed or graduated figure.

(3) Establish or settle the price of any article, commodity or transportation between them or themselves and others, so as directly or indirectly to preclude a free and unrestricted competition among themselves, or any purchasers or consumers in the sale or transportation of any such article or commodity.

(4) Agree to pool, combine or directly or indirectly unite any interests that they may have connected with the sale or transportation of any such article or commodity, that its price might in any manner be affected."

"Sec. 16723. **Agreement, etc., for reasonable profit excepted.** No agreement, combination or association is unlawful or within the provisions of this chapter, the object and purpose of which are to conduct operations at a reasonable profit

or to market at a reasonable profit those products which can not otherwise be so marketed."

"**Sec. 16724. Interest of seller or manufacturer in transportation, etc., facilities.** It is not unlawful, or within the provisions of this chapter, for persons engaged in the business of selling or manufacturing commodities of a similar or like character, to employ, form, organize or own any interest in any association, firm or corporation which has as its object or purpose the transportation, marketing or delivery of such commodity."

"**Sec. 16725. Associations, etc., to promote competition or further trade.** It is not unlawful to enter into agreements or form associations or combinations, the purpose and effect of which is to promote, encourage or increase competition in any trade or industry, or which are in furtherance of trade."

"**Sec. 16726. Trusts not excepted void.** Except as provided in this chapter, every trust is unlawful, against public policy and void."

Section 16750 of said Code provides for a civil remedy to an injured party, and Section 16755 provides for the criminal prosecution and criminal penalty for any violation of said Act.

It is the present Cartwright Act, the provisions of the Business and Professions Code, which was assailed by respondents and declared unconstitutional by the District Court of Appeal. Contrary to petitioner's contention, it was the entire Act, not merely sections 16723 and 16724, which were declared unconstitutional.

Reasons for Denying the Petition for Writ of Certiorari

A. The District Court of Appeal correctly held that the Cartwright Act, upon which this action is founded, is unconstitutional and void in that it violates the due process clause of the Federal Constitution. Said Act, by reason of the various exceptions therein contained, leaves the whole statute so indefinite and uncertain as to be without a fixed standard of obedience.

B. The District Court of Appeal correctly held that the provisions of the Cartwright Act (secs. 16723, 16724 of Business and Professions Code) cannot be separated from the rest of the Act (sec. 16720, Business and Professions Code) without destroying the entire Act and doing violence to the legislative intent. Such a determination is a matter of State law and binding upon this Court.

C. The District Court of Appeal correctly held that the principles of due process of law requiring reasonable certainty of description, in fixing a standard for exacting obedience from a person in advance, applies equally to civil proceedings.

D. The District Court of Appeal correctly held that the decision of this Court in *Cline v. Frink Dairies* (274 U. S. 445; 47 S. Ct. 681; 71 L. Ed. 1146) is controlling in this action.

E. The decision of the District Court is in accord with, and fully supported by, the decisions of this Court.

F. The Cartwright Act is not an important piece of legislation but has been dormant since the decision of the *Cline v. Frink* case and its invalidity has generally been conceded and accepted by both the bench and bar of California since the aforesaid decision.

Summary of Argument.

I.

The construction and meaning of a State statute, and whether any part thereof is separable from the remainder, is a matter upon which the State courts, and not the Federal courts, speak with final authority.

II.

The decision in *Cline v. Frink Dairies* is controlling in this case and the District Court of Appeal correctly held that the Cartwright Act is unconstitutional in that the various exceptions therein contained leave the whole staute so indefinite and uncertain as to be without a fixed standard of obedience, thereby violating the due process clause of the Federal Constitution.

III.

The principle of due process of law, requiring reasonable certainty of description in fixing a standard for exacting obedience from a person in advance, applies equally in civil proceedings.

IV.

The Cartwright Act has not been considered important legislation since the *Cline v. Frink Dairies* decision and its invalidity generally has been recognized in California. It "has been more honored in the breach than its observance".

I.
ARGUMENT.

I.

The Construction and Meaning of a State Statute, and Whether Any Part Thereof Is Separable From the Remainder, Is a Matter of State Law, and the State Court's Construction Thereof Must Be Accepted by This Court in Determining Whether Such Statute Is Repugnant to the Federal Constitution.

(a) The Construction Placed Upon the Cartwright Act by the District Court of Appeal, That Sec. 16720 Business and Professions Code Is Not Independent of, or Severable From, Sections 16723 and 16724 of the Same Code, Is Binding Upon This Court in Determining Whether the Cartwright Act Violated the 14th Amendment.

The California District Court of Appeal held that section 16720 of the Business and Professions Code was not independent of, or severable from, sections 16723 and 16724 of the same Code. [R. p. 48.] Notwithstanding such construction placed upon the Act by the California court, petitioner now contends that such construction is incorrect and is reviewable by this Court. Such a contention cannot be sustained.

It is fundamental and well settled that this Supreme Court is without power to place a different construction upon a State enactment from that adopted by the State court. The meaning of the statute as so fixed by the State court must be accepted by this Supreme Court as if such meaning had been specifically expressed in the enactment and must be taken by this Court to express the intention and purposes of the State's lawmakers.

This rule is clearly stated and firmly applied in *Morehead v. New York Ex Rel. Tipaldo,* 298 U. S. 587, 609; 80 L. Ed. 1347, 1354. On page 1354 of 80 L. Ed., the Court states:

> "Petitioner's contention that the Court of Appeals misconstrued the Act cannot be entertained. This court is without power to put a different construction upon the state enactment from that adopted by the highest court of the State. We are not at liberty to consider petitioner's argument based on the construction repudiated by that court. The meaning of the statute as fixed by its decision must be accepted here as if the meaning had been specifically expressed in the enactment. Supreme Lodge, K. P. v. Meyer, 265 U. S. 30, 32, 68 L. ed. 885, 887, 44 S. Ct. 432. Exclusive authority to enact carries with it final authority to say what the measure means. Jones v. Prairie Oil & Gas Co., 273 U. S. 195, 200, 71 L. ed. 602, 608, 47 S. Ct. 338. . . . As our construction of an Act of Congress must be deemed by state courts to be the law of the United States, so this New York Act as construed by her court of last resort, must here be taken to express the intention and purpose of her lawmakers. Green v. Neal, 6 Pet. 291, 295-298, 8 L. ed. 402, 404, 405."

The same rule is also stated and applied in *International Harvester Co. v. Kentucky,* 234 U. S. 216, 220, 58 L. ed. 1284, 1286; *Quong Ham Wah Co. v. I. A. C. of California,* 255 U. S. 445, 448, 65 L. ed. 723, 724; *Olson v. Smith,* 195 U. S. 332, 342, 49 L. ed. 224, 229; *Meyers v. Wells Fargo & Co.,* 223 U. S. 298, 302, 56 L. ed. 445, 448; *King v. West Virginia,* 216 U. S. 92, 54 L. ed. 396; *W. W. Cargill Co. v. Minnesota,* 180 U. S. 452, 466. 45 L. ed. 619, 625.

The foregoing rule is also applicable where the question to be determined is whether any part of the State statute is separable from the remainder thereof and the State court's determination of separability or non-separability likewise is conclusive and binding upon this Court.

The language of the late Justice Cardozo, then Chief Justice of the New York Court of Appeals, in *People v. Mancuso,* 255 N. Y. 463, 175 N. E. 177, 76 A. L. R. 514, 521, wherein a large number of United States Supreme Court cases are reviewed, perhaps best states the rule thusly:

> "To what extent a severance of good from bad is permissible with a view to the preservation of a statute is a question of construction as to which the courts of the state, and not the federal courts, must speak with ultimate authority. People *ex rel.* Alpha Portland Cement Co. v. Knapp, 230 N. Y. 48, 60, 129 N. E. 202; Meyer v. Wells, Fargo & Co., 223 U. S. 298, 302, 32 S. Ct. 218, 220, 56 L. ed. 445; Berea College v. Kentucky, 211 U. S. 45, 55, 29 S. Ct. 33, 53 L. ed. 81; Loeb v. Columbia Township Trustees, 179 U. S. 472, 490, 21 S. Ct. 174, 45 L. ed. 280; Huntington v. Worthen, 120 U. S. 97, 7 S. Ct. 467, 30 L. ed. 588."

In *Olson v. Smith, supra,* this Court stated the rule as follows:

> "Whether the illegal clauses granting discriminatory exemptions could be eliminated without destroying the other provisions of the state laws regulating pilotage is a state, and not a Federal, question. For the purpose of determining the validity of the statutes in their Federal aspect this court accepts the interpretation given to the statutes by the state court, and tests their validity accordingly."

In *International Harvester Co. v. Kentucky, supra,* involving the anti-trust laws of Kentucky, the construction of several statutes enacted at different times was involved and it was contended that the construction placed upon such statutes by the Kentucky court was incorrect. This Court followed the construction placed thereon by the Kentucky court, stating:

> "We follow the Kentucky Court of Appeals in taking what they derive from the legislation of the State as if it were embodied in a single act." (58 L. Ed. 1286.)

In *W. W. Cargill Co. v. Minnesota, supra,* the State Supreme Court held that the State act therein involved was severable. This Supreme Court followed that interpretation, declaring it "to be elementary that it should adopt 'the interpretation of a statute of a state affixed to it by the court of last resort thereof' ".

In *Meyers v. Wells, Fargo & Co., supra,* Justice Holmes stated:

> "Whether the statute could be construed as separable, of course, would be ultimately in the State court, in any event."

The same rule was announced in *King v. West Virginia, supra.*

We respectfully submit that the question of separability of the provisions of the Cartwright Act is not open for review by this Court and that the California District Court of Appeals' interpretation thereof is binding upon this Court.

(b) The Construction Placed Upon the Cartwright Act by the District Court of Appeals, That the Provisions Thereof Are Not Separable, Is Correct.

The District Court of Appeal correctly held that sections 16723 and 16724 of the Business and Professions Code were not independent of nor severable from section 16720 of the same Code. Whether the aforesaid two sections can be separated from section 16720 of the aforesaid Code in legal effect without destroying the entire Act and the legislative intent is settled conclusively by *Cline v. Frink Dairies, supra,* and *Blake v. Paramount Pictures,* 22 Fed. Supp. 249. In *Blake v. Paramount Pictures, supra,* the United States District Court, Southern District of California, in a case arising in California, held and declared the Cartwright Act itself to be unconstitutional and void [quoted extensively in R. pp. 30-33, inclusive]. The aforesaid two cases held that the act involved therein must be construed as a whole and that provisions therein involved cannot be separately construed.

Sections 16723 and 16724 are a part of parcel of, and a part of the very definition of, the acts and combinations condemned in section 16720. If, of course, the California Legislature intended that section 16720 should stand by itself, it could have done so by simply reenacting section 16720 and omitting sections 16723 and 16724. It certainly had the opportunity to do so when the Cartwright Act was reenacted in the Business and Professions Code in 1941. But it did not see fit to do so. The Legislature must have been familiar with the decision in the *Cline* and *Blake* cases, *supra*—yet it reenacted the Cartwright Act in its entirety. By section 16701 it excluded as a rule of interpretation the usual separable clause found in legislative enactments, to-wit, section 24 of the Business and

Professions Code. It did not want to omit sections 16723 and 16724 and reenact section 16720 by itself because if it had done so, it would have made criminals out of thousands of the innocent and would have condemned as illegal those thousands of associations looked upon today as legal in California; it apparently took the position that the entire Act, including sections 16720, 16723 and 16724, were all valid or all invalid. As stated in *People v. Yosemite Lumber Co.*, 191 Cal. 267, at 279:

> ". . . We are impelled to the conclusion that the act was intended by its framers to stand or fall as a whole. . . ."

The deletion of section 24 of the Business and Professions Code as a rule of construction clearly demonstrates that the California Legislature, in reenacting the Cartwright Act in the Business and Professions Code, intended the statute to stand or fall as a whole and announced a rule against the mutilation of the statute. The effect of the inclusion or omission of a provision similar to the excluded section 24 of the Business and Professions Code in a legislative enactment was recently considered by this Court, in the case of *Carter v. Carter Coal Co.*, 298 U. S. 238, 321, 80 L. ed. 1160, at 1189. The rule announced therein is so pertinent that we quote therefrom:

> "Finally, we are brought to the price-fixing provisions of the code. The necessity of considering the question of their constitutionality will depend upon whether they are separable from the labor provisions so that they can stand independently. Section 15 of the act provides:
>
> > 'If any provision of this Act, or the application thereof to any person or circumstances, is

held invalid, the remainder of the Act and the application of such provisions to other persons or circumstances shall not be affected thereby.'

In the absence of such a provision, the presumption is that the legislature intends an act to be effective as an entirety—that is to say, the rule is against the mutilation of a statute; and if any provision be unconstitutional, the presumption is that the remaining provisions fall with it. The effect of the statute is to reverse this presumption in favor of inseparability, and create the opposite one of separability. Under the non-statutory rule, the burden is upon the supporter of the legislation to show the separability of the provisions involved. Under the statutory rule, the burden is shifted to the assailant to show their inseparability."

The rule as to separability is well stated in the case of *Hale v. McGettigan*, 114 Cal. 112, at page 119, where the rule is stated as follows:

"Whether a statute containing an unconstitutional provision, with others which are constitutional, will be sustained as to those which are constitutional and held invalid merely as to those which are not, depends upon the nature of the different provisions in view of the evident purpose of the legislature. If the provisions are so interdependent that those which are invalid are to be regarded as the condition or consideration upon which others were enacted, and it is evident that the legislature would not have enacted the statute except in its entirety, and did not intend that any part should have effect unless the whole could be made operative, the entire statute must be held invalid."

In the late case of *In re Portnoy*, 21 Cal. (2d) 237, at page 242, the Supreme Court of California stated the rule thusly:

> ". . . The rule is well settled, where such a severability clause is included, that the valid portions of a statute or ordinance which is partially unconstitutional will be upheld if the remaining portion is severable and constitutes a completely operative expression of the legislative intent. (*Bacon Service Corp. v. Huss*, 199 Cal. 21, 32 (248 Pac. 235).) *On the contrary, however, where the invalid portions of the statute are so connected with the rest of the statute as to be inseparable, it is clear that the entire act must fall.* (*Bacon Service Corp. v. Huss, supra; In re White*, 195 Cal. 516 (234 P. 396); *Robison v. Payne*, 20 Cal. App. (2d) 103 (66 P. (2d) 710).)" (Italics ours.)

To the same effect is:

Robison v. Payne, 20 Cal. App. (2d) 103 at 106;

Pasadena City High School District v. Upjohn, 206 Cal. 775 at 779;

Carter v. Carter Coal Co., supra.

And so we have the same thing in the case at bar. If the legislature wanted to re-enact the Cartwright Act without including the exceptions contained in sections 16723 and 16724, it could have easily eliminated the objectionable provisions; it did not choose to do so. *Here sections 16723 and 16724 relate to and affect and limit equally each and every division and subdivision of section 16720.* The invalidity of the entire Act is, therefore, crystal clear.

Petitioner attempts to avoid the effect of the foregoing by arguing that it was only the 1909 amendment which fell under the *Cline v. Frink* case and the rest of the Act should stand.

It is a rule in California that a statute cannot simply be amended, but that the entire Act *as amended must be reenacted.* Article IV, section 24, of the California State Constitution so provides as follows:

> ". . . No law shall be revised or amended by reference to its title; but in such case the act revised or section amended shall be re-enacted and published at length as revised and amended; . . ."

Under this section the amended act is intended as a substitute for the original statute, continuing in force that which is reenacted.

> *People v. Western Fruit Growers,* 22 Cal. (2d) 494, 500, 501;
>
> *Sherer v. Flannery,* 68 Cal. App. 91, 94;
>
> *Pierce v. County of Solano,* 62 Cal. App. 465, 469.

Where the amended statute, as reenacted, contains invalid portions which are so interwoven and connected with the rest of the statute that the invalid portions thereof cannot be separated without destroying the rest of the act, the entire act must fall.

This Supreme Court had no hesitancy in striking down the Lever Act *as amended,* which was involved in *U. S. v. Cohen Grocery Co.,* 255 U. S. 81, 41 S. Ct. Rep. 295, 63 L. ed. 516, and in *A. B. Small Co. v. American Sugar Refining Company,* 267 U. S. 233, 69 L. ed. 589, 593. In

these cases it was primarily the 1919 amendment to the Lever Act which invalidated the entire Act by creating "an enlargement of the enumerated exceptions". But the entire Act fell, not merely the amendment.

As stated in *Blake v. Paramount Pictures,* in which Judge Yankwich declared the Cartwright Act itself unconstitutional, "there is no way of segregating the proviso (sections 16723, 16724) from the definition (section 16720). It was intended to affect the acts denounced as crimes." (Parentheses ours.)

Further, the Legislature, by deleting Section 24 of the Business and Professions Code as a rule of construction in determining the validity of the Cartwright Act, expressly excluded the rule of construction now urged by petitioner.

Neither does petitioner's reference to or reliance upon section 2 of the Business and Professions Code, enacted in 1937, improve his position. The said section merely provides that the new sections of the Business and Professions Code should be construed the same as the old law if the new sections are substantially the same as the old. Such is the general rule of law without the said section. However, section 24, and not section 2, of said Code, determines the *separability* of the provisions of the Business and Professions Code, and since section 24 was expressly *excluded* as a rule of construction in determining the separability of the provisions of the Cartwright Act, as reenacted in 1941, the specific and later section in the Cartwright Act (section 16701 Business and Pro-

fessions Code) must prevail over the general and earlier section relied upon by petitioner (*Pierce v. Riley,* 21 Cal. App. (2d) 513; *Coca-Cola Bottling Co. v. Feliciano,* 32 Cal. App. (2d) 351). Particularly is this true when the reenacted law requires a definite construction (*Guardianship of Reynolds,* 60 Cal. App. (2d) 569, 675). Here section 16701 requires a definite construction to be placed upon separability of the Cartwright Act.

It also has consistently been held that the reenacted and amended Act must be construed and considered as a new and original piece of legislation, for the purpose of construing the *entire Act as amended.* (*Smith v. Board of Trustees,* 198 Cal. 301, 306; *Dalton v. Jewett,* 88 Cal. 530; *Reed Orchard Co. v. Superior Court,* 19 Cal. App. 648, 656.) By deleting section 24, the Cartwright Act must be so construed, and as so construed, the entire Act falls. Also, if petitioner's contention is that only the 1909 amendment is unconstitutional, that contention alone is sufficient ground for construing the present Cartwright Act as a new enactment (*County of Los Angeles v. Jones,* 6 Cal. (2d) 695, 708).

The weakness of petitioner's contention is disclosed by the great length to which he goes in his attempt to justify his contention that the question of separability of the Cartwright Act was determined by Federal and not by California law. He concedes that the District Court of Appeal in its Opinion spoke of sections 16723 and 16724 as "inseparable" from the rest of the Cartwright Act, but contends that such a characterization was based upon the

interpretation given the Colorado Act by this Court in the *Cline* case and, therefore, was determined under Federal and not California law. The decision of the District Court of Appeal, itself, belies such argument. The California Court stated:

> ". . . Plaintiff contends, however, that his action comes within the provisions of section 16720 and that sections 16723 and 16724 are separate and independent of section 16720. We find no merit in this contention. Sections 16723 and 16724 unquestionably refer to all the subdivisions of section 16720. By their enactment, the Legislature attempted to limit the various subdivisions of section 16720 but in doing so made the limitations so indefinite that no standard was left in the statute by which a court can determine the guilt or innocence of those accused of its violations. Section 16720 is not independent of or severable from the other two sections. . . ." [R. p. 48.]

Certainly such a construction of a California statute by a California court, based upon the legislative intent of the California Legislature, can only be considered to be a matter of California law. No Federal law is therein involved.

Petitioner's contention that the various provisions of the Cartwright Act are separable and that this Court may so determine, notwithstanding a contrary construction placed thereon by the California court, we submit is without merit.

II.

The Decision of This Court in Cline v. Frink Dairies, Supra, Is Controlling in This Case, and the District Court of Appeal Correctly Held That the Cartwright Act Contravenes the 14th Amendment of the Federal Constitution.

Petitioner contends that the decision of this Court in *Cline v. Frink Dairies, supra,* is easily distinguishable from the case at bar. Such contention is without merit. Since the validity of the principles upon which the *Cline v. Frink Dairies* decision rests is not challenged, petitioner is restricted to the sole ground that the *Cline v. Frink Dairies* case is "easily distinguishable". (*Morehead v. New York ex rel. Tipaldo, supra.*)

In 1927, the Colorado Anti-Trust Law, which is a counterpart of the Cartwright Act, was declared unconstitutional and void by this Supreme Court, in the case of *Cline v. Frink Dairies, supra* [quoted extensively R. pp. 27-30].

In *Blake v. Paramount Pictures, supra,* the United States District Court, Southern District of California, in a case arising in California, held and declared the Cartwright Act, itself, to be unconstitutional and void [quoted extensively R. pp. 30-34].

This decision also held that the decision in the *Cline v. Frink Dairies* case was controlling.

In *Redlands Foothill Groves v. Jacobs,* 30 Fed. Supp. 995, the same United States District Court again reiterated that the Cartwright Act was unconstitutional and void.

The only California case reported subsequent to the *Cline v. Frink Dairies* decision which even discusses the

Cartwright Act is the case *In re Battelle*, 207 Cal. 227, at 250-251, wherein the Supreme Court of California stated that the Colorado Anti-Trust Law was by its terms "a replica of the Cartwright Act," and therein expressed doubt as to the constitutionality of the Cartwright Act. which only incidentally was involved therein, because of the decision in the *Cline* case by this Supreme Court [quoted extensively R. p. 33].

An examination of the *Cline v. Frink Dairies* decision and the pertinent provisions of the Cartwright Act set forth in the Business and Professions Code (previously quoted in this Brief) readily disclose that the said provisions which rendered the Colorado Anti-Trust Law without a fixed standard of obedience and, therefore, in violation of the Federal Constitution, are found in almost the exact language in the California Cartwright Act.

It, therefore, becomes crystal clear that the Cartwright Act, like the Colorado Anti-Trust Law involved in the *Cline v. Frink Dairies* case, is repugnant to the due process clause of the 14th Amendment of the Federal Constitution. The District Court of Appeal correctly held that said *Cline v. Frink Dairies* decision is controlling and conclusive in the case at bar.

The same rule as announced in the *Cline v. Frink Dairies* case has been applied and followed by this Court in numerous cases, both before and after the rendition of the *Cline v. Frink Dairies* decision. The rule therein announced has never been departed from. To cite the legion of cases applying the rule of the *Cline v. Frink Dairies* case would unduly extend this Brief. A few of the cases are: *International Harvester Co. v. Kentucky, supra; U. S. v. L. Cohen Grocery Co., supra; A. B. Small v.*

American Sugar Ref. Co., supra; Connally v. General Construction Co., 269 U. S. 385; 70 L. ed. 322; *Champlin Refining Co. v. Corporation Com.*, 286 U. S. 210; 76 L. ed. 1063; *Lanzetta v. New Jersey*, 306 U. S. 451; 83 L. ed. 889.

III.

The Principles of Due Process of Law Requiring Reasonable Certainty of Description in Fixing a Standard for Exacting Obedience From a Person in Advance Applies Equally in Civil Proceedings.

Petitioner claims that the *Cline v. Frink Dairies* case is not applicable herein because it involves a criminal statute and a criminal prosecution, whereas the case at bar is a civil action. That argument is untenable. The Cartwright Act, like the Colorado Anti-Trust Law, is a penal statute. It, like the Colorado Anti-Trust Law, contained penal provisions (section 16755 Business and Professions Code). Any statute, the object of which is to impose obedience, which inflicts punishment upon those who disregard the mandates of its provisions, is a penal statute, and the mere fact that civil redress may also be had thereunder does not change its character (23 Cal. Jur. 612; 50 Am. Jur. 34). The Colorado Act having been adjudicated to be a criminal statute, the Cartwright Act, containing similar and almost identical provisions, must likewise fall in the same category.

Petitioner attempts to distinguish the *Cline v. Frink Dairies* case from the case at bar upon the sole theory that that case involved a criminal prosecution; and he contends that the rule therein announced is applicable only to criminal proceedings. On page 18 of his Petition, he

states, as the basis of the *Cline* case, the following: "It is these criminal penalties and these alone, which are made the basis of the decision of this Court in *Cline v. Frink Co.*"

That very contention was advanced to and rejected by this Supreme Court in *A. B. Small Co. v. American Sugar Refining Co., supra,* which was a civil action involving the due process clause of the 14th Amendment of the Federal Constitution. In rejecting such argument, Mr. Justice Van Devanter, speaking for the Court, stated (p. 593 of 69 L. ed.):

> "The defendant attempts to distinguish those cases because they were criminal prosecutions. But that is not an adequate distinction. The ground or principle of the decisions was not such as to be applicable only to criminal prosecutions. It was not the criminal penalty that was held invalid, but the exaction of obedience to a rule or standard which was so vague and indefinite as really to be no rule or standard at all. Any other means of exaction, such as declaring the transaction unlawful or stripping a participant of his rights under it, was equally within the principle of those cases. They have been so construed and applied by other courts in civil proceedings. Standard Chemicals & Metals Corp. v. Waugh Chemical Corp., 231 N. Y. 51, 54; 14 A. L. R. 1054; 131 N. E. 566; Dunman v. South Texas Lumber Co. (Tex. Civ. App.), 252 S. W. 274, 275. In the first of these citations, the court of appeals of New York, referring to this court's ruling in the L. Cohen Grocery Co. case, well said:
>
> 'The ground on which it placed its judgment applies, and with like consequences, to civil suits as well. The prohibition was declared a nullity because

too vague to be intelligible. No standard of duty had been established . . . The variant views of judges of the district courts were quoted as evidence of the absence of a standard. If this is the rationale of the decision, its consequences are not limited to criminal prosecutions. A prohibition so indefinite as to be unintelligible is not a prohibition by which conduct can be governed. It is not a rule at all; it is merely exhortation and entreaty.' "

The case of *Cline v. Frink Dairies, supra,* itself disposes of petitioner's contention in the following language (p. 1155 of 71 L. ed.).

> "The principle of due process of law requiring reasonable certainty of description in fixing a standard for exacting obedience from a person in advance has application as well in civil as in criminal legislation (*A. B. Small Co. v. American Sugar Ref. Co.,* 267 U. S. 233, 238, *et seq.,* 69 L. ed. 589, 593, 45 Sup. Ct. Rep. 295), but the fact it is often necessary to investigate and decide certain questions in civil cases is not controlling or persuasive as to whether persons may be held to civil or criminal liability for not deciding them rightly in advance."

In *Blake v. Paramount Pictures, supra,* a case involving the Cartwright Act itself, Judge Yankwich also held that the *Cline v. Frink Dairies* decision was applicable to civil proceedings; he stated:

> ". . . But there is no way of segregating the proviso from the definition. It was intended to affect the acts denounced as crimes. It being invalid, as introducing an uncertain element into them, the acts denounced cease to be illegal, and no penalty, civil or criminal, can be bottomed on them."

To the same effect are the cases of *Connally v. General Construction Co.*, 269 U. S. 385; 45 S. Ct. Rep. 126; 70 L. ed. 322; *Standard Chemicals Etc. Co. v. Waugh Chemical Corp.*, 231 N. Y. 51; 131 N. E. 566; 14 A. L. R. 1054; *Dunman v. So. Tex. Lumber Co.*, 252 S. W. 274.

In *Champlin Refining Co. v. Corporation Com., supra,* this Court again reiterated the rule that where a statute was so vague and indefinite as to be without a fixed standard of obedience, it was not merely the penalty prescribed therein which was invalid but the entire statute itself fell. On page 1083 of 76 L. ed., that rule is stated thusly:

> "In the light of our decisions, it appears upon a mere inspection that these general words and phrases are so vague and indefinite that any penalty prescribed for their violation constitutes a denial of due process of law. It is not the penalty itself that is invalid but the exaction of obedience to a rule or standard that is so vague and indefinite as to be really no rule or standard at all." (Citing many authorities, including the *Cline v. Frink Dairies* case.)

Petitioner leans very heavily upon the case of *Levy Leasing Co. v. Siegel,* 258 U. S. 242, to support his contention that a different rule is applicable to civil proceedings. This case has been fully and thoroughly distinguished in *Small Co. v. American Sugar Refining Co., supra,* and the inadvertent statement "dealing with definitions of crime" found in the *Levy* case is fully explained and in effect is nullified. The *Small* case explains

that the words of the aforesaid statement did "not adequately reflect the matter dealt with"; that "it was broader than they indicate; and, of course, they were not intended to qualify or limit the decision". (Referring to the *U. S. v. Cohen* case.)

While Petitioner quotes the statement found in the *Small* case, he entirely fails to quote the explanation of said statement therein given by this Court. The explanation given defeats rather than upholds Petitioner's contention herein. In none of the other cases cited by Petitioner, wherein the *Levy* case is cited, is Petitioner's contention supported. Wherever the *Levy* case has been cited, it has been used in connection with facts similar to those involved in the *Levy* case. Most of those cases involve war emergency legislation and the statutes were construed accordingly.

The case of *U. S. v. Nash* cited by Petitioner has been so thoroughly distinguished and limited in so many of the cases of this Court, including the *Cline v. Frink Dairies* case, that no useful purpose would be served in further discussion of said case.

We, therefore, respectfully submit that Petitioner's alleged distinction of the *Cline v. Frink Dairies* case from the case at bar is without foundation and that his contentions in respect thereto have been fully answered adversely by the adjudicated cases of this Court.

The decision in the *Cline v. Frink Dairies* case is controlling and decisive herein.

IV.

The Cartwright Act Has Not Been Considered Important Legislation in California Since the Cline v. Frink Dairies Decision and Its Invalidity Has Generally Been Recognized in This State Since the Rendition of the Aforesaid Decision.

Much ado is made by Petitioner about the so-called importance of the Cartwright Act, and many pages of the Petition are consumed in a dissertation upon the social and economic value of anti-trust laws. We do not herein, nor did we in any court below, question the social or economic benefits of anti-trust laws in general. Our challenge has been directed to the specific Cartwright Act involved, and it is that Act which the District Court of Appeal of California has held to be repugnant to the Federal Constitution.

No matter how laudable may be the purpose of a statute, it has never been held by this or any other Court that a laudability of purpose alone is sufficient to overcome, or to deprive one of, the constitutional guarantees afforded by the Constitution of the United States. The rights given to one under the due process clause of the 14th Amendment cannot lightly be disregarded, and if a beneficial statute is stricken down because it is repugnant to the Federal Constitution, the resulting harm must be laid at the door of the Legislature, not the courts.

The duty of the court in such case is clear. Constitutional guarantees must be upheld, and though the performance of such duties might often result in unpleasantness, such duties cannot be shirked.

Nor is there any merit to Petitioner's contention that the Cartwright Act is an important piece of legislation. As a statute it has been dormant and "without any teeth" since the rendition of the *Cline v. Frink Dairies* decision by this Honorable Court in 1927. The very fact that since the decision of this Supreme Court in the *Cline v. Frink* case there has been no reported case by any of the higher courts of the State of California concerning the Cartwright Act, indicates the conclusiveness with which the decision in the *Cline* case has been accepted in California, upon the constitutional questions involved herein.

The only reported cases since the *Cline* decision have flatly declared the Cartwright Act unconstitutional. Certainly Petitioner has submitted nothing to overcome the decisions submitted by the Respondents herein, from which it is crystal clear that the Cartwright Act in question is unconstitutional. The following statement attributed to Governor Earl Warren, the Governor of California and himself a former attorney-general of this State, found in the "Los Angeles Daily Journal" of February 28, 1945, graphically illustrates the disrepute in which the Cartwright Act has fallen since the rendition of the *Cline* decision. We quote:

> "Governor Earl Warren, himself a former attorney-general of the State, said the law, passed as the Cartwright Act in 1907, 'has been more honored in the breach than its observance'."

We can add nothing to the foregoing statement.

Conclusion.

Respondents respectfully submit that the decision of the District Court of Appeal correctly states the law and has correctly decided this case; that Petitioner has utterly failed to establish any ground which would entitle him to the issuance of a Writ of Certiorari by this Honorable Court; that the question of whether provisions of the Cartwright Act are separable is a matter of California, and not Federal, law; that the decision of this Honorable Court in *Cline v. Frink Dairies* is controlling herein; that the principles of due process requiring reasonable certainty of description in fixing a standard for exacting obedience applies equally in civil actions; and that the Cartwright Act has long been considered invalid in the State of California, since the rendition of the *Cline* decision by this Court.

It is, therefore, respectfully submitted that this case is not a proper one for review by certiorari in this Court and that the Petition for a Writ of Certiorari should be denied.

Dated: This 31st day of May, 1945.

Respectfully submitted,

CHARLES J. KATZ,
SAMUEL W. BLUM,
MAURICE SCHULMAN,
Attorneys for Respondents.

SAMUEL W. BLUM
Of counsel.